

# THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

VOL. 47 No. 10

182

MARCH 22, 1954

WHOLE No. 1176

## CONTENTS

P. MacKENDRICK: Herodotus: The Making of a World Historian . . . . .	145
A. J. B. WACE: The Coming of the Greeks . . . . .	152
Reviews . . . . .	155

E. A. Hahn, *Subjunctive and Optative: Their Origin as Futures* (Whatmough); O. Hoffmann and A. Debrunner, *Geschichte der griechischen Sprache*, I (Poultney); G. R. Davidson, *Corinth*, XII: *The Minor Objects* (Robinson); R. Robinson, *Plato's Earlier Dialectic*, 2d ed. (Morrow); B. Jowett, D. J. Allan, and H. E. Dale, *The Dialogues of Plato* (Greene); A. Ernout and F. Thomas, *Syntaxe latine* (Kent).

### HERODOTUS: THE MAKING OF A WORLD HISTORIAN\*

1. *Introduction.* "Herodotus," says Gibbon, "sometimes writes for children and sometimes for philosophers." Precisely here lies his charm and his importance. His charm is a compound of simplicity, straightforwardness, garrulity, wit, wide-ranging intellectual curiosity, and a gift and a zest for story-telling and for imparting information without condescending. He is the sort of man who has only to cross the street to have an interesting experience. His importance as a world historian, the "Father of History," results from his having discovered and chosen as the theme of his work the idea and the value of freedom under law, the freedom which the Greeks in the Persian Wars fought for under Athenian leadership against the threat of despotic imperialism. This discovery H. made in the Athens of Pericles; it had educative value for him, and his treatment of it is meant, without pedantry or shallow moralizing, to instruct us, his readers. Through his eyes we see that the Greeks fought our battles, that their victories and defeats are ours, that our ideals are vital because they struggled. But, because he is mature, his vision is not dazzled by over-optimism; there is tragedy in him, too; the tragedy of the destruction that follows upon pride. His fate, it has been well said, has been that of Mozart: "his charm, wit, and

effortless ease have diverted attention from the note of profound sadness and pity sounded not seldom in his History."<sup>1</sup>

For classical scholars H. is of peculiar interest because our present knowledge of him is a triumph of modern scientific research, originating in 19th century higher criticism and modified and refined in the last forty years. To describe and assess that triumph is the humble purpose of this paper.<sup>2</sup>

2. *Life.* H. was born in the years between Marathon and Salamis, in Carian Halicarnassus, an area Doric in background, Ionic in dialect; at H.'s birth ruled by a tyrant-vassal of Persia, it became by 454 a tribute-pay-

<sup>1</sup> This paper attempts to assay the present state of Herodotean scholarship (as of Sept. 1953), and makes little claim to originality. The chief authorities on which it depends are cited in note 2.

References in the text: Gibbon: cited by J. Wells, *Studies in H.* (Oxford 1923) 226. Intellectual curiosity: E. Howald, *Vom Geist antiker Geschichtsschreibung* (Munich 1944) 11-45, who makes it a vice, not a virtue—i.e., H. has no system; contrast Pohlenz (see note 2 below) 44, 91. Educative aim: the omission of H. from W. Jaeger's *Paideia* (3 vols.; Oxford and New York 1939-45) is extraordinary. Greeks fought our battles: K. J. Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.* (2d ed.; Strassburg and Berlin 1912-27) II.2 (1916) 33. H. and Mozart: J. D. Denniston in *OCD* s.v. "Herodotus" (§ 11). Pessimism: W. Schadewaldt, "Die Anfänge der Geschichtsschreibung bei den Griechen," *Die Antike* 10 (1934) 144ff.

<sup>2</sup> Chief authorities (see also note 15):

J. = F. Jacoby, art. "Herodotus" in *RE* Supplbd. II (1913) cols. 205-520. Still fundamental, especially for its view of the effect of Athens upon H. (237-243); exhaustive schematic view

\* Professor MacKendrick's survey article is the fourth in the series announced in *CW* 46 (1952/53) 261. See *CW* 46 (1952/53) 233ff.; 47 (1953/54) 33ff., 49ff., 129ff.

ing member of the Athenian Empire. All this may have had its effect upon H.: his admiration of Doric Sparta, his Ionic literary language, his appreciation of the Persians, with their English public school manners; the fascination that Athens exerted over him. His family was distinguished, including an uncle who was an epic poet; it may have played a part in overthrowing the tyrant. Herodotus was well educated, with a thorough grounding in the poets, especially Homer. His informal education was equally important; his innate

curiosity must early have been stimulated by conversations on the docks with the tanned and bearded sailors fresh back from voyages to the Pillars of Hercules and beyond. A political refugee, he lived for a time in Samos. He travelled nearly the length and breadth of the known world, perhaps with traders or for trading; and, wherever he went, he used his eyes and, though he probably knew no language but Greek, asked endless questions. He was in Athens lecturing perhaps 447-444, knew prominent members of noble families, Sophocles and probably Pericles, and was profoundly impressed by the Athenian Enlightenment, and it by him, if the story that he was awarded a prize of ten talents is true. He was a member of Pericles' colony sent in 443 to Thurii, in S. Italy, along with Lampon the expert in religious law, Protagoras and Euthydemus the sophists, Empedocles the philosopher, and Hippodamus the city-planner. His tomb and epitaph were shown in Thurii,

of the work and its digressions (283-326); analysis of H.'s sources (392-467).

G. = T. R. Glover, *Herodotus* (Berkeley 1924). Sound, informative survey in pleasant popular style by a scholar in love with his author.

H.-W. = W. W. How and J. Wells, *A Commentary on H.* (2d ed., 2 vols.; Oxford 1928). Standard in English, though in need of revision; good maps.

L. = Ph.-E. Legrand, *Hérodote: Introduction* (Paris 1932). Good general survey, by another scholar who loves his author; in Budé series, in which L.'s translation, with exhaustive *Notices*, esp. on (oral) sources, has now reached in 8 vols. the end of Book 8.

S. = W. Schmid, in W. Schmid and O. Stählin, *Gesch. d. gr. Lit.* 1.2 (Munich 1934) 550-673. Fullest treatment since J.: complete citation of literature to 1934; discursive and repetitious (like H.), but indispensable.

P. = M. Pohlenz, *Herodot, der erste Geschichtschreiber des Abendlandes* (Berlin 1937; = "Neue Wege zur Antike," II 7-8). Searches for unity of H.'s "Grand Design," his purpose, art, and achievement. See note 6 below.

Powell, *Lex.* = J. E. Powell, *Lexicon to H.* (Cambridge 1938).

Powell, *Hist.* = J. E. Powell, *The History of H.* (Cambridge 1939). Competent, logical, unconventional, and truculent analysis of composition (development from "Persian history" to "Persian wars"; see § 4b); bibliography of earlier monographs.

deS. = G. de Sanctis, "Erodoto e la origine della storiografia," in his *Storia dei Greci* (2d ed.; Florence 1942) I 201-233. Summarizes early articles (cited in his valuable bibliography). See also *id.*, art. "Erodoto" in *Encid. It.* 14 (1932) 258-262. Stresses H.'s debt to predecessors, believes, like P., in a "Persian history"; denies that H. was pro-Pericles (see § 4c).

Powell, *Hdt.* = J. E. Powell, *Herodotus* (2 vols.; Oxford, 1949). A translation into Biblical English, with valuable introduction for the general reader, summarizing and modifying his earlier iconoclastic views; list of over 1000 textual variants; invaluable index of proper names; good maps.

M. = J. L. Myres, *Herodotus, the Father of History* (Oxford 1953). The fruit of 60 years' thinking. An appreciation by the grand old man of Herodotean studies; esp. valuable for "Tabular Analysis" (118-134); study of "pedimental" structure (see note 7 below); maps. See *id.*, art. "Herodotus" in *OCD* (with J. D. Denniston): exemplary.

For further bibliography, see notes below; also *L'Année Philologique*; Bursian's *Jahresberichte* 263 (1939) 100-160: report for 1928-36, by W. Sieveking (with references to earlier reports back to 1873); A. Colonna (cited in note 6 below); P. Collomp, *BFS* 9 (1930/31) 26f., 116f., 237f. A. Izzo d'Accini's Italian translation (Florence 1951) summarizes literature through 1947. There has been no major American work on H.; a study, *Three Battles in H.*, is in progress by Professor Richmond Lattimore of Bryn Mawr.

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is published weekly from mid-November for sixteen issues, except for any weeks in which there is an academic vacation. Volume 47 contains issues dated November 9, 16, 30; December 14 (1953); January 4; February 1, 15; March 1, 8, 22, 29; April 5, 26; May 3, 10, 17 (1954).

Owner and Publisher, The Classical Association of the Atlantic States. Place of publication, Fordham University, 441 East Fordham Road, New York 58, N. Y.

General subscription price, \$3.75 per volume in the Western Hemisphere; elsewhere \$4.25. Price to members of the C. A. A. S., \$3.25. All subscriptions run by the volume. Single numbers, to subscribers, 20 cents, to others, 30 cents prepaid (otherwise 30 cents and 40 cents). If affidavit to invoice is required, 60 cents must be added to the subscription price. For residents of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia, a subscription to THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY (or, alternatively, to the *Classical Journal*) is included in the membership fee of the C. A. A. S.; whose members may also take *Classical Outlook*, *Classical Journal*, and *Classical Bulletin* at special prices in combinations available from the Secretary-Treasurer of the C. A. A. S., Eugene W. Miller, 3328 Cathedral of Learning, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh 13, Pa.

Reentered as second class matter December 14, 1950 at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in the Act of February 28, 1925 authorized December 14, 1950.

#### STAFF

##### EDITOR

Edward A. Robinson...Fordham University, New York 58, N. Y.

#### CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

Lionel Casson.....New York University, New York 3, N. Y.

Philip Mayerson.....New York University, New York 3, N. Y.

William H. Stahl.....New York University, New York 53, N. Y.

Waldo E. Sweet.....University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

but he probably returned to Athens and died there, perhaps in the Great Plague of 429.<sup>3</sup>

3. *Travels*. "At the most moderate estimate, his travels covered a space of 31° of longitude, or 1700 miles, and 24° of latitude, or nearly the same distance." His visit to Egypt was early and important; he may have traversed it more than once, correcting, enlarging and continuing the descriptive work of his predecessor, Hecataeus of Miletus. His longest stay probably embraced four months; the immense span of Egyptian history taught him perspective; he regarded Egypt as the root of all culture; his syncretizing of Egyptian gods with Greek founds the science of comparative religion. Here as elsewhere modern research, especially in archaeology, has repeatedly testified to his accuracy or good faith. He touched at Gaza and Tyre, and sailed down the Euphrates to Babylon; he knew the Persian Royal Road from Sardis to Susa; the Greek cities of Ionia and the Aegaeon and Ionian islands; he traced the route of Xerxes through Thrace to Thermopylae and beyond; he saw and was impressed by the monuments and the oracle at the holy city of Delphi. He says more than Thucydides about the ancient monuments of Periclean Athens. On the outer edges, he reports on Scythia (modern Rumania and S. Russia) and Libya and Cyrenaica. In the west he knows Magna Graecia, but his silence about the lands beyond suggests that his main interest was not geographical but historical; the Far West has no bearing on Persian and Greek, and what they fought each other for. Everywhere he examined, inquired, made measurements, gathered materials: on the antiquity of the nation, the extent of the country, its rivers, its customs and traditions, its religion. Everywhere tolerance accompanies curiosity; the barbarian was in the family and Herodotus likes him, often recognizing, especially in Egypt, a level of culture higher than his own.<sup>4</sup>

3 J. 205ff.; G. chs. 18-36; H.-W. I 1-20; L. 1-24; S. 551-591; M. 1-16 and *OCd* § 1. Testimonia in Stein (cited in note 15). H. and Homer: S. 553, note 3; P. 212f. H. and other poets: S. 554, notes 1-8. H.'s acquaintance with Philaids and Alcmaeonids: J. 413; G. W. Williams, "The Curse of the Alkm," *Hermathena* 78 (1951) 32-49; 79 (1952) 3-21; 80 (1952) 58-71; H.-W. I 42; A. Garzetti, "E. e il decreto di Milziade dein exenai," *Aevum* 27 (1953) 18-21. H. and Aeschylus: P. 185. H. and Sophocles: S. 318, note 3. DeS. notes (213) that H. mentions Pericles only once, but M. (12, note 4) finds 9 allusions; see § 4c and note 7. Story of the 10 talents: S. 590, note 5; J. P., and M. believe in the award but not the amount; L., P. (66, 208), and deS. believe he lectured; Powell, *Hist.* (31) perversely denies it. Thuri: S. 588-590; J. and L. think H. died in Thuri ca. 420; O. J. Todd, "On the Date of H.'s Death," *CQ* 16 (1922) 35ff., denies this, followed by M.

4 J. 247ff.; G. chs. 4-5; L. 24-37; G. Rawlinson and E. M. Walker, *Encycl. Brit.* (11th ed. [1910]) s.v. "Herodotus" (382). On Egypt, see W. G. Waddell's ed. of Bk. 2 (cited in note 15); W. Spiegelberg, *Die Glaubwürdigkeit von Herodots Bericht über*

4. *Work: a. Plan*. The division of H.'s *Histories* into 9 books is arbitrary, illogical, and late; the naming of them for the nine Muses is some librarian's fancy. H. himself referred to the parts of his work as *logoi*: a *logos* is a tale that is told. Any attempt to trace a thread of Ariadne through the labyrinth of H.'s digressions implies certain assumptions as to the aim he set before him; these are discussed in the next paragraph. Meanwhile, the simplest scheme proposed in modern times is as follows; it falls into nine parts, but these do not correspond to the conventional book divisions:

Book 1.1-5 Prooemion. This is best set forth as a title page:

HERODOTUS OF HALICARNASSUS

THE PUBLICATION OF HIS RESEARCHES  
TO THE END THAT

NEITHER MEN'S DEEDS MAY FADE WITH TIME  
NOR THE GREAT AND MARVELOUS WORKS

SHOWN FORTH BY BOTH THE GREEKS AND THE BARBARIANS  
REMAIN UNSUNG,

BOTH OTHER MATTERS AND  
THE CAUSE

OF THEIR WARRING WITH ONE ANOTHER

1. Bk. 1.6-94. Greeks and Lydians. Croesus, the first who wronged the Greeks. The rise and fall of Lydia. A tragedy: *The Capture of Sardis*.
2. Bk. 1.95-216. The Rise of the Persian Empire: Cyrus the Great and the Conquest of Ionia.
3. Bks. 2.1-3.66. Cambyses and the Conquest of Egypt.
4. Bk. 3.67-160. Darius: his accession and administrative reforms. The Persians in Samos: (A

*Aegypten im Lichte der ägyptischen Denkmäler* (Heidelberg 1926; = "Orient u. Antike," III; Eng. trans., *The Credibility of Herodotus' Account of Egypt in the Light of the Egyptian Monuments* [Oxford 1927]); H.-W. I 411-424; J. Vogt, *H. in Aegypten* (Stuttgart 1929); M. 152-158, with bibl. On Hecataeus: Jacoby in *FGH Hist* I 1-373; cf. L. Pearson, *Early Ionian Historians* (Oxford 1939); R. Fertonani, "Ecateo . . . e il suo razionalismo," *PP fasc. 22* (1952) 18-29; W. A. Heidel, "Hecataeus and the Egyptian Priests in H., Book II," *Mem. Am. Acad. of Arts and Sciences* 18 (1935) 53-134, criticized by P. 79, note 2; K. von Fritz, "H. and the Growth of Greek Historiography," *TAPA* 67 (1936) 315-340, who thinks Egypt marks H.'s turning-point from rationalist hypercriticism of the over-schematization of Hecataeus and his school to empiric scepticism. On Babylon: H.-W. I 379; O. E. Ravn, *H.'s Description of Babylon* (Copenhagen 1942). The Royal Road: H.-W. II 21. Ionian background: R. M. Cook, "Ionia and Greece in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries B.C.," *JHS* 66 (1946) 67-98. On Polycrates and Samos: P. N. Ure, *The Origin of Tyranny* (Cambridge 1922) ch. 3. On Scythia: M. J. Rostovtzeff, *Scythien u. d. Bosphorus I* (Berlin 1931). On Libya: L. Malten, *Kyrene* (Berlin 1911); = "Philologische Untersuchungen," XX). Standard pattern in H.'s account of Egypt and Libya: Powell, *Hist.* 16; expanded: M. 73. DeS. (in *Encicli. It.*) thinks war conditions would have prevented H. from travelling in Persia till after the Peace of Callias; T. Sinko, "Speciegium Herodoteum," *Eos* 33 (1930/31) 475-489, thinks only modern wars close frontiers entirely.

triptych: *The Rise and Fall of Polycrates*). The first threat against the Greeks in Europe.

5. Bks. 4.1-5.27. Persian aggression in Europe and Africa: Scythia and Libya; Thrace and the Hellespont. Greece threatened.
6. Bks. 5.28-6.42. The Ionian Revolt: forming "alternate chapters" with an account of *Contemporary Events in European Greece*. A tragedy: *Cleomenes Gone Mad*.
7. Bk. 6.43-140. Darius against Greece: Marathon.
8. Bks. 7.1-8.96. Xerxes against Greece: The war decided; Persian preparations; Greek preparations: the first clashes. Thermopylae and Artemisium, a land and sea defeat; Salamis, a crucial struggle.
9. Bks. 8.97-9.122. Xerxes against Greece: Plataea and Mycale: a land and sea victory. The Persians in retreat. Conclusion: a warning from Persia to Athens on imperialism.<sup>5</sup>

4b. *Aim*. As in Homeric criticism, H. has his Unitarians and his Separatists. The Unitarians believe that one Grand Design was present to his mind from the beginning: the search for causes: what the Greeks and the Persians fought each other for. There are two sects of Separatists: the one believes that H. wanted simply to collect his *logoi* and link them on the slender thread of the war between Greek and barbarian; the other believes that H. collected and organized his material in the first place not to illustrate the war between Greek and barbarian, but to compose an ethnographic work (*Persika*) on a large scale, improving on Hecataeus; as the collection grew, H. came almost unconsciously to abandon the ethnographic aim in favor of a larger and more solemn one: the description of the Persian Wars. Both sects base their reconstructions on internal evidence of displacement and correction; on references forward and back; on remaining traces of abandoned *logoi* like the famous one on the Assyrians, which would have balanced the *logos* on Egypt. The *logoi* in the broadest sense are of three kinds: (1) sophisticated versions of folk-tales (*Novelle*) like "Arion and the Dolphin" or

"Rhampsinitus and the Thief": Arabian Nights stories such as are still told by the story-tellers in the bazaars of the Near East; (2) chronicle, in chronological order, artistically wrought (Books 7-9); (3) ethnographic-geographical sections, like those on Egypt, Scythia, Libya. Over all the influence of Athens, intellectual, political, or both, is enormously strong. The title-page, which must have been written last, summarizes all: men's deeds have intrinsic value for man; great deeds are no monopoly of any people; such deeds are not a matter of chance but are motivated, and motives may be ascertained. The present has causes in the past, and the past has value for the present as a guide to the future. The step from here to Thucydides is a short one; this world-view is new, rational, and important: it justifies H.'s reputation as the Father of History.<sup>6</sup>

4c. *H. and Athens*. The intellectual impact of Athens upon H. (tragedy, Orphism, art, perhaps the Sophists) is hardly in doubt; the crucial question is whether he was influenced by Athenian politics, and specifically whether he was pro-Periclean. One school denies that he was an attentive political observer, and claims that Greek national sentiment left him cold, that he was above and outside the battle, and that he avoided taking sides; the other asserts that the *Histories* were written to justify the hegemony and policy of Athens (though H., like Pericles, hates imperialism), that H. is democratic even in the oldest stratum of his work and pro-Athenian in the latest, that he believes at bottom you can trust the people, that he was intimate with and cordial to the circle round Pericles, that his bias is proved by his own statement (7.139), "If one should say that the Athenians were the saviours of Greece, he would not fail of the truth," courageously published at a time (before 425) when Athens was unpopular in many quarters. All are agreed on the influence of tragedy on H.: his language is often Aeschylean; his delight in geography is like that of the *Prometheus Bound*; Aeschylus described Salamis before him; Sophocles was his friend; his work contains antistrophic and choral elements. Orphism and the Mysteries interested him emotionally but not intellectually. Art and architecture may have influenced the composition of his *Histories*. He knew the work of the Sophists,

<sup>5</sup> Tabular views: J. 283-326; L. 236 (followed in text, with modifications from M.); Powell, *Hdt.* xiv-xv; M. 118-134. Two elaborate theories of triadic structures: F. Pfister, "Das Gesetz der Symmetrie u. d. Gesch. des H.," *PhW* 52 (1932) 1109-1116; J. W. S. Blom, *De typische getallen bij Hom. en H.* (Nymwegen 1936). On "pedimental" composition: M. 8, 64, 87, 90, 102. Importance of *prooemium*: S. 586, note 1; M. 66, 67 (proem as title-page), 135; see also § 4b. Croesus-logos: F. Hellmann, *Herodots Kroisos-Logos* (Berlin 1934); = "Neue Philologische Untersuchungen," 5): the *logos* does not imply complete revision of Bk. 1; warning theme important: see Bischoff (cited in note 8); P. 112ff. On tragic heroes like Cleomenes: H. Berve, "Fürstliche Herren zur Zeit der Perserkriege," *Die Antike* 12 (1936) 1ff., and, in opposition, H. Bengtson, *Einzelpersonlichkeit u. ath. Staat zur Zeit des Peisistratos u. des Miltiades* (SBAW 1939, Heft. 1).

<sup>6</sup> Controversy well summarized by A. Colonna, "Erodoto," *Paideia* 1 (1946) 350-351. Unitarians: represented by P., esp. 21ff., 73ff.; cf. O. Regenbogen, "H. u. sein Werk," *Die Antike* 6 (1930) 202ff. Separatists: J.; L. (vs. deS.); Powell, *Hdt.* and *Hdt.*; M. mediates. Cross-references: S. 592, note 8; P. 87ff.; Powell, *Hdt.* 1-3, 89-90. Assyrian *logoi*: S. 561, note 3. *Novelle*: W. Aly, *Volksmärchen, Sage u. Novelle bei H.* (Göttingen 1921). Importance of *aitiē*: K. Pagel, *Die Bedeutung des aitiologischen Momentes für Herodots Gesch.* (Leipzig 1927); F. Egermann, "Das Gesch. des H.: sein Plan," *NJAB* 1 (1938) 191-197, 239-254.

but their influence is in doubt. He mentions only Pythagoras and Thales by name, but the distinctions in the Solon-Croesus episode came from Prodicus, and his vocabulary and figures of speech are often sophistic, though not to excess. The numerous speeches in his *Histories* are too often forgotten: they bear witness at least to the overwhelming importance in the *polis* of the spoken word, and at the most to sophistic influence. Sophistry at all events did not alter H.'s fundamental beliefs, or his concept of the function of history. He is neither as serious as Sophocles, as worried as Euripides, nor as coldly indifferent as Thucydides. By the Athenian Enlightenment he was fascinated but not enslaved.<sup>7</sup>

4d. *Religion in H.* The *Histories* are written on two levels, divine and human, for no one can write the history of a people without describing its faith. It may be that early conventional upbringing retarded H.'s development; that the influence of Egyptian religion on him was unhealthy. In any case the Persian Wars were to him

religious wars, in which Providence played a part, and Xerxes, the tragic hero, is under a necessity that transcends history. But the idea of the jealousy of the gods fills H. with more awe than devotion; though he is interested in oracles, he recognizes their charlatanry; his defence of Delphi in an age of doubt shows more unconventional courage than credulity. Fundamentally he believes that not the victory of the individual over authority but of order over chaos is what is important. Apart from this he is a pragmatist; Man is the measure; he can take initiative, order, dominate his universe; in H. the intervention of the gods is always hearsay, not the *aitiê*. His ethics is democratic and old-fashioned: what he values is piety (though he may not practice it), community spirit, self-sacrifice, and sturdy poverty. In the end his *Histories* leave the way open for suprarationalist or rationalist interpretation, and so must we.<sup>8</sup>

4e. *Dependability.* "Sir," said an Oxford undergraduate to Sir John Myres, "if Herodotus is such a fool as they say, why do we study him for Greats?" H. nowadays no longer seems a fool, as he did to some in the 19th century; H. the Father of Lies is dead; H. the Father of History flourishes. His errors and misunderstandings are fewer than used to be thought. He himself states his position clearly (7.152): "And as for me, I am bound to tell what is told, but to believe it I am by no means bound; and let this saying extend to every part of my history."

<sup>7</sup> H. as political and/or non Periclean: F. Focke, *H. als Historiker* (Stuttgart 1927); E. Schwartz, "Geschichtsschreibung u. Gesch. bei den Hellenen," *Die Antike* 4 (1928) 20ff. (H. felt impact of Athenian political life but was not a Periclean; this article contains in brief a full if controversial picture of H.); J. Wells, "H. and Athens," *CP* 23 (1928) 317-331; L. 29-37; S. 580, note 4; K. Wüst, *Politisches Denken bei H.* (Würzburg 1935); L. A. Stella, "Erodoto ed Atene," *Atene e Roma* 3 (1935) 272-281; 4 (1936) 73-100 (stresses influence of tragedy); A. Heubeck, *Das Nationalbewusstsein des H.* (Erlangen 1936), who asserts, as vs. deS., H.'s pride in Greek nationality; A. Andrewes, "Eunomia," *CQ* 32 (1938) 89-102 (the word in H. stresses a citizen's conduct, not a type of constitution); H. Kleinknecht, "H. und Athen," *Hermes* 75 (1940) 241-264; W. Jaeger, *Paideia*, I 380ff.; deS.; W. Marg, "H. über die Folgen von Salamis," *Hermes* 81 (1953) 196-210. H. pro-Periclean: J. 237 (strongly and persuasively reiterated in J.'s *Atthis* [Oxford 1949] 72, 76, 129, 160, 221 and respective notes; G. 221; P. 163-177; M. 11. Influence of tragedy: H. Föhl, *Tragische Kunst bei H.* (Leipzig 1913; S. 570-572; P. 213f.; M. 62ff. and ch. 5. Orphism, etc.; S. 572 and notes; H. Panitz, *Mythos u. Orakel bei H.* (Greifswald 1935): to be used with caution; Legrand, "H. croyait-il aux oracles?" *Mélanges Desrousseaux* (Paris 1937) 275-284. Art. etc: M. chs. 4 and 5 (new [but see J. Geffcken, *Hermes* 62 (1927) 12ff., and R. Gross, "Thermopylai in künstlerischer Gestaltung bei H.," *NJAB* 3 (1940) 87-94] and important, but perhaps over-ingenious). Sophists and speeches: W. Nestle, "Herodots Verhältnis zur Philologie u. Sophistik," *Progr. Schönlank* 1906-08; J. Wells, "H. and the Intellectual Life of his Age," *Studies in H.* 183ff.; A. Deffner, *Die Rede bei H. u. ihre Weiterbildung bei Thukydides* (Munich 1933); E. Schulz, *Die Reden in H.* (Greifswald 1933); S. 572-577; P. 107, 185 (strongly denies Sophistic influence); L. Solmsen, "Speeches in H.'s Account of the Ionic Revolt," *AJP* 64 (1943) 194-207. Vocabulary: M. Wundt, *De Herodoti elocutione cum sophistarum comparata* (Leipzig 1903); W. C. Beckmann, *The Political Use of Moral Terms in H.* (diss. Wisconsin [Madison 1952; typescript on file in the University of Wisconsin Library]). For all questions of vocabulary in H., Powell's *Lexicon* (see above note 2) is invaluable. See also, for H.'s political vocabulary, H. Schäfer, *Staatsform u. Politik* (Leipzig 1932).

<sup>8</sup> G. 260-290; H.-W. I 32 (rationalization of myths), 43 ("too theological"), 48-50 (theological attitude, pessimism, Nemesis); L. 131-139; S. 610-626; P. 96-119 (strongly stresses H.'s piety); deS. 214-218; M. 46-59; A. Maddalena, "L'umano e il divino in E.," *Studi Mondolfo* (Bari 1950) 56-84; F. Wehrli, *Lathe biasas: Studien zur ältesten Ethik bei den Griechen* (Leipzig-Berlin 1931) esp. 31ff., 60ff. (no moral value judgment; gods' revenge independent of deserts of victims; e.g., Croesus); U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Glaube der Hellenen II* (Berlin 1931) 205 (H.'s eclecticism, running gamut from Aeschylean theology to rationalism, is typical of his age); W. Nestle, *Die griechische Religiosität II* (Berlin 1932) 102ff. (H. never resolved contradiction between Ionic [?] drive to research and archaic piety; cf. and contrast P. 58, 73, 90, and cf. A. Maddalena, "L'uomo erodoteo," *AIV* 101 [1941/42] 351-381); H. Bischoff, *Der Warner bei H.* (Marburg 1932), who stresses H.'s belief in free will and responsibility; cf. R. Latimore, "The Wise Adviser in H.," *CP* 34 (1939) 24-35; T. Gomperz, *Pensatori Greci* (2d ed., trans. L. Bandini [Florence 1932], 390-407); H. not a monotheist in disguise, but a positivist; O. Kern, *Die Religion der Griechen II* (Berlin 1935) 261ff., 282f. (idea of *phthonos theôn* product of Persian Wars; influence of Athens on H.'s religion); F. Taeger, "Charismatische Ideen bei H.," *Klio* 28 (1935) 255-261 (idea of direct intervention of gods more Asiatic than Athenian); G. C. J. Daniëls, *Religieuze-historische studie over Herodotus* (Antwerp 1946); H., like Socrates, neither sceptic nor groveller, but a "religious pragmatist"; Jacoby, *Atthis* 129; Powell, *Hdt.* xix-xxi, citing 5.63, 6.66, 7.6 to prove H. aware of charlatanry of oracles. H.'s idea of man: A. Maddalena, *Interpretazioni erodotee* (Padua 1942) 83ff.



When he says he has been somewhere or seen something, we can generally believe him. The worst that can be said of him is that information is something that he accepts or rejects *en bloc*; that he is an honest reporter who will not hold himself responsible for hearsay evidence, and that he aimed at, but did not entirely achieve, accuracy. He never handles gossip for its own sake, and never indiscriminately. He often leaves the reader to choose between versions, or suspends judgment. In sum, "his information is seen now to be such as an intelligent and observant man, of his age and upbringing, might reasonably accept, on eyewitness and hearsay, as true."<sup>9</sup>

4i. *Sources.* Sources and their value are one question, H.'s use of them as it affects his competence as a historian another; it is with the latter that we are concerned here. His research (*historiē*) rests chiefly on eyewitness (*opsis*), hearsay (*akoē*), and inference (*gnōmē*) and on literature besides if there was any. His chief predecessor, Hecataeus, he cites usually to refute. He may have drawn upon the author of *Airs Waters Places*; he had access to various official lists; e.g., of Persian satraps; he derived much information, probably oral, from members of Athenian clans (*genē*), and he may be influenced, as in Solon's eulogy of Tellus the Athenian, by funeral orations (*epitaphioi*). His lack of foreign languages seems to have hampered him little. Where he quotes, he quotes poetry; he may not have felt that the level of his audience was up to prose. Some written sources he may innocently conceal through following the general ancient practice of citing authorities only when disagreeing with them. In any case he is no plagiarist; his principle is to report nothing but what he "knew" (with his own eyes and ears), an ideal never achieved before him in historiography, and seldom since.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Sayce (see note 15) is chiefly responsible for H.'s reputation as Father of Lies. Rehabilitation: J. 467-469; G. 1, 66-68, 76-85; H.-W. I 32, 34-35, 44-45 (strong reservations); L. 57-93; deS. in *Encicl. It.* (reservations on Egypt); S. 626-627, 631-638 (even chronology remarkably sound); P. 177-221; Jacoby, *Atthis* 120, 157; M. 17-31 and in *OCD* § 9. Among numerous testimonials to H.'s accuracy, see, e.g., K. Meuli, "Scythica," *Hermes* 69 (1935) 121-176 (H. our best source for Scythian religion; even where he does not understand, he is always clear); A. Christiansen, *L'Iran* (Copenhagen 1936): H. "generally dependable" [242]; B. van Groningen, "L'exploit de Cléobis et Biton et la veracité d'H.," *Mnemosyne* 12 (1944) 34-43 (H. confirmed by archaeology and epigraphy). C. Hignett, *A Hist. of the Athenian Constitution* (Oxford 1952) 32, 158, otherwise sceptical, bases his account of Cleisthenes squarely on the assumed credibility of H.; of also Myres, "Cleisthenes in H.," *Mélanges Glotz* (Paris 1932) II 657-666. But L. Pearson, "Credulity and Scepticism in H.," *TAPA* 72 (1941) 335-355, believes H. disguises his inner convictions to avoid offending his readers' religious susceptibilities.

<sup>10</sup> J. 392-467; H.-W. I 20-32; Legrand (in the *Notices* to his Budé trans. [see above note 2]), who consistently emphasizes,

4g. *Date of publication.* The work must have been published and available in Athens by 425, since in that year Aristophanes parodied it in the *Acharnians*. It contains no certain references later than 429, and none to Greek affairs 447-432, during much of which time H. may have been in Thurii. Sophocles' knowledge of the work in the *Antigone* (probably of 441) was based on H.'s lectures. H. added various details for various publics; he was still working and altering in Athens in 429. A related question is whether the work is finished; the consensus is affirmative, chiefly on the evidence of 9.107-122, which is held to display, elaborately, Persian demoralization, contrasted with initial hardness. The work is finished in the sense that H. has poured into its pages all that his notes contained. But, given his inquiring mind, and the evidence of constant and not always final revision within the book, we must conclude that his *Histories* are not the sort of book that is ever, to the author's satisfaction, entirely finished.<sup>11</sup>

perhaps over-emphasizes, oral traditions; S. 627-631 and notes; P. 190; Jacoby, *Atthis* 120, 151 (nothing to be gained by introducing one or several Herodotoi before H.), and Index s.v. "Herodotus, sources of" (no change from his 1913 position); Powell, *Hdt.* x-xi; M. 17, 159-161 (sources for Pers. hist.: Pers. friends, satrapy list), 194-202 (Ionian revolt: the "List of Sea Powers" [Eusebius 2.226 Schöne]; cf. G. Nenci, "Le fonti di E. sull'insurrezione ionica," *RAL*, ser. 8, 5 [1950] 106-118: Ionian source, objectively and faithfully rendered), 263, note 2 (muster-roll of Salamis); cf. M. in *OCD* §§ 3, 8. H. and the Hippocratic Corpus: S. 554, note 10; P. 52 (medical writers later than H.). List of H.'s lists: S. 637, note 5; D. W. Prakken, "H. and the Spartan King-Lists," *TAPA* 71 (1940) 460-472. H. and the monuments: Macan (see note 15) lviii-lix. *Epitaphioi*: S. 580, note 2, citing L. Weber, *Hermes* 57 (1922) 377ff.; L. Weber, *Solon u. die Schöpfung der att. Grabrede* (Frankfurt-am-Main 1935) 72ff.; this view rejected by P. 112, note 3; but see 3.80, 5.94, 7.161, 9.27. H. and foreign languages: S. 557, note 8, citing H. Diels, *NJB* 25 (1910) 14ff., who assesses H.'s knowledge of for. lang. unconventionally high. Quotation: H. W. Parke, "Citation and Recitation," *Hermathena* 67 (1946) 80-92; citation by name only when disagreeing: J. 508; A. M. Pizzagalli, "Un modello orientale dell'episodio di Aristagora e Cleomene," *RIL* 70 (1937) 75-82, believes the source, at several removes, is a Babylonian document on an expedition of Sargon of Akkad into Asia Minor. M. Hadas has written on "Utopian Sources in H.," *CP* 30 (1935) 113-121.

<sup>11</sup> J. 372-379 (work unfinished); H.-W. I 15-16 (finished); L. 22-23 (posthumous publication); P. 163 (finished); Legrand, Budé trans., Vol. 7 (1951) 8, note 1 (argues, citing P. Amandry, *BCH* 70 [1946] 1-8, that the work is finished, on the evidence of the dedication of the Athenian Stoa at Delphi, dated in 478, and symbolizing, as does the end of H.'s book, the close of an important phase of the war); S. 590-591, 595-597 and notes (finished by 425; end of Bk. 9 not written in Athens); Powell, *Hist.* 85 (early version published in the 'forties; deS., in *Encicl. It.*, thinks *Antigone* refs. are to work in lecture form); Powell, *Hdt.* xvi-xvii (allusions to minor events 431-429; supersedes H.-W.); M. 14, 16, and in *OCD* § 6 (Thuc. 1.89 begins where H. leaves off). Congenitally unfinished: R. Cohen, *La Grèce et l'Hellénisation du monde antique* (3d ed.; Paris 1948) 170-171. K. Glaser, "Das Schlusswort des H.," *Commentationes*

4h. *Dialect, style.* H.'s dialect is a literary Ionic, conventional and old-fashioned, and certainly not an Alexandrian invention; though the evidence of our Mss. is untrustworthy, contemporary inscriptions in Ionic bear out many of the forms attested in them; since the inscriptions show variant forms, the text of H. should not be altered in the name of a consistency that never existed. H.'s style is simple, like the Gospels; like his work as a whole, it prefers co-ordination to subordination, and is surprisingly free of sophistic mannerisms. To appreciate to the full H.'s easy manner, we should think for a moment (*horresco referens*) what the Persian Wars would have been like in style if Thucydides had written them.<sup>12</sup>

5. *Personality.* Most critics stress the originality of H.'s emphasis on the individual, the sincerity of his artistic conscience, the unique and perhaps a little uneasy combination in him of novelist and researcher, his hatred of war. Impartial he is not; no ancient (or modern?) historical work was ever written *sine ira ac studio*; but in him "patriotism is tempered by comparison of régimes and customs, and by respect for age-long Oriental experience." Remarks on his "malignity" reflect on his critics. A minority of modern scholars refer to "the flickering light of an uncertain rationalism" in him, or deny his ability to establish a historical fact. The majority would subscribe to this admirable statement:

His personality is written in his book. Explorer, observer, and listener, he combines encyclopaedic interest and curiosity—about deeds rather than ideas—with humane sympathy and goodwill. Childlike, he loves wonders and secrets, enjoys a tale and a joke, and tells them vividly. Devoid of race prejudice and intolerance, he venerates antiquity and is fascinated by novelties; and in these things trusts informants overmuch. Without linguistic skill, he extracts information from all; without military insight, he has recorded a great war. For a philosophy he has common sense, moral honesty, and piety.<sup>13</sup>

6. *Reputation.* The quarrel between Thucydides and H. has been exaggerated; Thuc. felt H.'s influence but not his witchery; after H.'s researches there was only one step more to take: to contemporary history, facts, and causes; without H. as forerunner, Thuc. would have found that step even more difficult. The anecdote of Thuc.'s enthusiasm at H.'s lectures may be literally false, but it is symbolically true; Thuc.'s famous reference to a "prize composition for the present moment" may not even have H. in mind. H. did by instinct what Thuc. did upon reflection, and H.'s intent, if not his manner, is often Thucydidean. The list of authors who use him, praise him, or condemn him is a long one; it includes Ctesias, author of a *Persika*, who corrects him; Xenophon; the local historians of Attica ("Atthidographers"); Aeneas Tacitus, who draws on him for *exempla*; Isocrates, who disparages him; Ephorus, who also corrects him; Theopompus, who epitomized him; Aristotle, who cites him in the *Rhetoric*, *Athenian Constitution*, and scientific works; the Alexander historians; Manetho, the Hellenistic historian of Egypt; Aristarchus the grammarian, who probably wrote a commentary on him; Eratosthenes, who criticized him; Posidonius, who popularized him among the Romans; Cicero, who coined the phrase "Father of History"; Diodorus; Strabo; Livy, who adapts *Novellae* and might be called the Roman H.; Quintilian, who calls him *dulcis et candidus et fusus*; the author of *On the Sublime*, who dubs him "most Homeric." Plutarch criticizes his character, not his skill; with the Greeks of the "Second Sophistic" (Arrian, Pausanias, Lucian, Aelian, Philostratus, Dio, Libanius, Procopius) he was exceptionally popular. In the Renaissance he was translated by Valla, defended by Étienne, admired by Melanchthon. Schiller and Browning among poets, Gibbon and Macaulay among historians, have felt his fascination. In the 20th century the range, Oriental interests, and deep religious feeling of the classically-trained historian Arnold Toynbee make him a latter-day Herodotus.<sup>14</sup>

*Vindobonenses* 1 (1935) 12, interprets the end of Bk. 9 as a warning to Athens to avoid exceeding the mean, and implies that the work is finished. See also Egermann (cited in note 6).

12 J. 486-504, 517-520; L. 170-177, 194-195; S. 640-659; Powell, *Hdt.* xvii-xviii; Denniston (*loc. cit.* in note 1); J. A. K. Thomson, *The Art of the Logos* (London 1935). H.'s dialect is treated in most elementary texts; e.g., by W. W. Merry and J. Strachan and in Powell's ed. of Bk. 8 ix-xvi (see note 15). Fuller treatment: H. W. Smyth, *Sounds and Inflections of the Gk. Dialects: Ionic* (Oxford 1894); F. Bechtel, *Die gr. Dialekte III* (Berlin 1924); M. Untersteiner (see note 15); *id.*, *La lingua di E.* (Bari 1949). Problems of dialect forms in the MSS: G. Pasquali, *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo* (2d ed.; Florence 1952) 306ff.; A. Colonna, "Tradizione manoscritta e critica congetturale in E.," *Athenaeum*, N.S. 18 (1940) 11ff. A fine parody of H.'s style, with marginal notes parodying German editions, is J. D. Bradley's Gaisford Gk. Prose Prize composition, *H. at the Zoo* (Oxford 1907).

13 L. 37-178 (H. rather facile than learned; rather gifted than hard-working). *Id.*, "De la malignité d'H.," *Mélanges Glotz* (Paris 1932) II 535ff.: Plutarch is deceived by H.'s cynicism about man's shortcomings. S. 606 (novelist-researcher), 638 (hates war), 660-661 (we should be thankful H. did not write like Thuc.). Adverse: Colonna, *Paideia* 1 (1946) 348; deS. 203. The quotations are from M. in *OCD* §§ 8, 9. On H.'s piety contrast above, § 4d.

14 J. 504-515; G. 69-75; L. 179-180; S. 664-671; Powell, *Hdt.* xvi; M. 17-19 and *OCD* § 10. Stein's *Testimonia* (see notes 3 and 15) are incomplete. See F. Rosanelli, "Le relazioni fra E. e Tucide," *Atene e Roma* N.S. 11 (1930) 150ff.: Thuc. pays H. the honor of continuing where he leaves off; Thuc. does not reject H. but expands and revises him [cf. A. W. Gomme, *Hist. Comm. on Thuc.* I (Oxford 1945) 148]; their common ground is love of Athens. On H. and Thuc. see esp. P. 215-220.

7. *Text, editions, translations.* The Mss. of H. are commonly divided into two families: a (*stirps Florentina*, s. x-xi) and b (*stirps Romana*, s. xiv). The papyri, of which we have 21, with excerpts from all 9 books, prove that this cleavage goes back to antiquity, but one of them suggests the existence of an independent textual tradition, which may also be represented in certain Mss. hitherto neglected. In these circumstances a practical eclecticism like that of Hude (1926<sup>3</sup>) or Legrand is the wisest editorial course. The *editio princeps* is an Aldine of 1502; of modern editions may be mentioned those of Stein, Abicht, Sayce-Macan, How and Wells (without text), Hondius, and van Groningen. There are innumerable school editions of single books. Among English translations the Elizabethan one of "B.R." (Bks. 1-2 only) is delightfully contemporary and expansive; G. Rawlinson is undeservedly standard; G. C. Macaulay's is accurate but forbidding; A. D. Godley's charming but inaccurate; J. E. Powell's Biblical in style but otherwise unconventional.<sup>15</sup>

8. *Conclusion.* All these men testify to the charm, perhaps unique among classical authors, which H. exerts over casual reader and scholar alike. Even the most truculent of his modern commentators pays him this tribute, with which we end:

H. represents an immense advance upon anything of which we know that preceded him, and forms a transition from the pre-classical era of custom, faith, and instinct to the self-conscious and self-critical questionings and strivings of the age which we call classical. A man who for the first time brought into relation as parts of one grand process the past vicissitudes and the physical environment of the peoples of the known world, and who saw that process itself as the dramatic working out of inscrutable and inevitable causation, such a man in his lifetime had experienced and played his part in a great widening and deepening of Greek thought, a bold advance of the human spirit.<sup>16</sup>

PAUL MACKENDRICK

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

<sup>15</sup> *Text*: J. 515-520; L. 179-199; S. 672-673; Powell, *Hdt.* II 687-722; M. 4. *Papyri*: L. 183-184; cf. H. G. Viljoen, *Herodoti fragmenta in papyris servata* (Groningen 1915), and, most recently, A. H. R. E. Paap, *De Herodoti reliquiis in papyris servatis* (Leiden 1948; = "Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava," 4), who adds three new ones, lists modern conjectures confirmed by papyri, and demonstrates need for a new large critical edition. Pap. Oxyr. 1092 suggests an independent tradition. A. Colonna, "De Herodoti memoria," *Boll. del Comitato per l'Edizione Nazionale dei Classici Greci e Latini*, N. S. 1 (1945) 41-83, has listed 59 MSS, and promises an analysis of the third family, represented by Laur. Conv. Sopp. 207, Laur. 70.6 (Triclinius' MS), and certain Vatican codd. For numerous contributions to the textual criticism of H. by Powell and L. Weber, see the standard bibliographies cited in note 2.

*Editions*: H. Stein (Berlin 1869-72; ed. mai.); with commentary: H. Stein (Berlin 1856-62; repeatedly reprinted; latest: 5 vols. in 7 pts., 4th-6th ed.: I. 1 (Bk. 1; 1901); I. 2 (Bk. 2; 1902); II. 1 (Bk. 3; 1893); II. 2 (Bk. 4; 1896); III (Bks. 5-6; 1894); IV (Bk. 7; 1908); V (Bks. 8-9; 1893); K. Abicht (Leipzig 1861-66; rpt.; latest: 5 vols. in 7 pts., 3rd-5th ed. (distribution of books of H. as in Stein): I. 1 (1903); I. 2 (1926); II. 1 (1926; rpt. of 3rd ed.); II. 2 (1886); III (1906); IV (1893); V (1892); A. H. Sayce (Bks. 1-3; London 1883); R. W. Macan (Bks. 4-6, 7-9; London 1895, 1908); K. Hude (Oxford Classical Texts; 3rd ed., 1926); Legrand (see note 2); J. J. E. Hondius and J. A. Schuursma (3rd ed.; Groningen 1949; marginal summaries, index of proper names, maps); B. van Groningen (4 vols. (through Bk. 6); Leiden 1946-50; for gymnasia and graduate students; in Dutch); editions of separate books: 1. J. H. Sleeman (Cambridge 1909); 2. A. Wiedemann (Leipzig 1890, W. G. Waddell (London 1939); 3. G. C. Macaulay (London 1890); 4-6. E. S. Schuckburgh (Cambridge 1905, 1890, 1889); 6. J. Strachan (London 1891); 7. Agnata Butler (London 1891); 8. J. E. Powell (Cambridge 1939); 9. Schuckburgh (Cambridge 1893), M. Untersteiner (Milan 1938); selections: W. W. Merry (2d ed.; Oxford 1901); Amy L. Barbour (Boston 1929).

*English translations*: see Powell, *Hdt.* xxiii-xxii; "B. R." (from Valla's Latin), ed. L. Whibley ("Tudor Translations"; 1924); G. Rawlinson (London 1858-60; ed. with introd. by A. W. Lawrence (London 1935) and by F. R. B. Godolphin, *The Ancient*

## THE COMING OF THE GREEKS\*

On the Greek Mainland from Neolithic times onwards we observe in the archaeology three main strata which apparently represent three different racial elements. The first is the Neolithic people, whose origin is veiled in mystery. There is no apparent connection between them and the Neolithic people of Crete. The second stratum is the Early Bronze (Early Helladic) people, who were probably related to the contemporary peoples of the islands and Crete. They possibly came from southwestern Asia Minor and seem to have introduced the words ending in *-inthos* (*asaminthos*), *-ssos* (*Parnassos*), and *-ene* (*Mykene*). They were presumably not Indo-Europeans. The third stratum is the Middle Bronze (Middle Helladic) people and between them and the Early Bronze Age people there is again a definite division

*Greek Historians I* (New York 1942); available also in "Everyman" and "Modern Library" series; G. C. Macaulay (London 1890); A. D. Godley (Loeb edition; London 1921-24); Powell, *Hdt.* (see note 2). The first vol. of a new trans. by A. de Selincourt in the Penguin series is announced for June 1954 (cf. *CW* 47 (1953/54) 65).

<sup>16</sup> The quotation is from Powell, *Hdt.* xxi-xxii.

\* A summary in English of the latest research in Greek Prehistory down to 1951 will be found in my article in *Historia* 2 (1953) 74-94, with a bibliography. The latest reports of prehistoric excavations in Greece will be found in the reports published in the *American Journal of Archaeology*, the *Journal of Hellenic Studies* and *Archaeology*. The German summary by F. Matz in *Handbuch der Archäologie* II.1 (Munich 1950) 179-308 is out of date and should be used with caution. See too the article by Sterling Dow, "Minoan Writing," *AJA* 58 (1954) 77-129; and that by Chadwick and Ventris, *Antiquity* 27 (1953) 196-206.



visible not only in the stratification of the excavated sites, but also in the material remains of the two peoples, pottery and house plans in particular.

After the coming of the Middle Bronze Age people into Greece there is no apparent archaeological interruption to the steady and gradual evolution of civilisation in Greece. The Middle Bronze Age develops into the Late Bronze Age, the Mycenaean Age, and the Late Bronze Age into the Early Iron Age and there are no signs of the intrusion of any new racial factor. The Early Iron Age in its turn evolves into the Classical Period, the great age of ancient Greece with its literature, art, philosophy. Thus, since the inhabitants of Greece in the Classical Period were Greeks and spoke and wrote Greek, we can only conclude that the time of their arrival in Greece was the Middle Bronze Age. In other words, the new race with a new culture which entered Greece at the beginning of the Middle Bronze Age was the Greek race, the first Hellenes to come to Greece. Other waves of Greek speaking peoples like the Dorians probably came into Greece at different dates in later times, but the Middle Helladic people were the first Greeks. After their arrival they would have coalesced with the existing population, which was no doubt a mixture of the Neolithic and Early Bronze Age peoples. The substance of this archaeological argument is that the Mycenaeans of the Late Bronze Age would have been Greeks and would have spoken and written Greek. The Mycenaean culture therefore is the first manifestation of Greek art and civilisation.

In Crete Evans discovered three forms of writing. The first consists of hieroglyphs. The second and third are syllabic scripts known as Linear A and Linear B. The hieroglyphs are older and were developed in the Middle Bronze Age in Crete, where the people then differed racially from those on the Greek Mainland. These were succeeded by the Linear A script, which was in general use in the various centres of culture in Crete. In Crete the Linear B script is found only at Knossos, where it succeeds Linear A, while the rest of Crete continued to employ the Linear A script. The origin and development of Linear B must remain an open question especially in view of the extremely perishable nature of the tablets.

Now the discovery of clay tablets inscribed in the Linear B script on the Greek Mainland at Pylos and Mycenae and of inscribed vases at Orchomenos, Thebes, Eleusis, Tiryns, and Mycenae shows that this script was freely used in Mycenaean Greece in the late Bronze Age.

Hitherto scholars who have endeavoured to decipher the Cretan scripts have proceeded on the assumption that the language of Crete was throughout non-Indo-European. Now, however, that it is realised that Linear B represents the language of the Greek Mainland, whose population archaeologists believe then to have been Greek,

Ventris assisted by Chadwick and Bennett has worked at it with the idea that it might be Greek. Their work on this basis has been remarkably successful, and they can now read enough on the tablets from Knossos, Pylos, and Mycenae to make it practically certain that the language is an early form of Greek, "Old Achaean" as it is called for the present. It is of course a truism that if the Mycenaeans were Greeks they should have written in Greek. It is now recognised also that the Linear A script represents a different language, presumably the Cretan language. This may be "Eteocretan," which is believed to have survived in the inscriptions from Praesos of the 4th Century B.C., which are in Greek characters but not in Greek. At any rate, if the language of Linear B is Greek there must have been Greeks at Knossos at the time when the Knossian Linear B tablets were written, that is to say from the beginning of Late Minoan II, roughly from about 1500 B.C. onwards.

Towards the end of the Middle Bronze Age, the people of the Greek Mainland, who were Greeks, came in contact with the Minoan culture of Crete and adapted and adopted much from it. Some archaeologists have believed that this represents a conquest and colonisation of the Mainland by the Cretans. Others have believed that this was analogous to the spread of Greek culture and art in Etruria and reflects a spread of influence, but not a conquest or colonisation. The Greeks, though their art and alphabet were widely adopted by the Etruscans, never conquered or colonised any part of Etruria. It was also pointed out that in Late Minoan II at Knossos, which at this date differs from the rest of Crete, there appear several features which are characteristic of the Mainland. These are beehive tombs, throne rooms, alabastra, Ephyraean goblets, the "Palace Style." The style of the Knossian frescoes of this period is more akin to that of the Mainland frescoes than to that of the rest of Crete. In other words, the "Palace Period" at Knossos, which Evans had already recognised as a new régime and as distinct from the culture of other Cretan centres, is a period of strong Mainland influence at Knossos. This is the period of Linear B tablets, which are written in Greek and in the script of the Mycenaean or Greek Mainland. The obvious conclusion is that at this date, Late Minoan II, Knossos was in the hands of Greeks.

Thus the decipherment of the Linear B tablets as Greek gives linguistic support to two archaeological conclusions previously deduced, (1) that the Mycenaeans were Greeks, (2) that in Late Minoan II, the "Palace Period," Knossos was Greek, or at least under strong Greek influence. These results, based both on linguistic and on archaeological evidence, are of the utmost importance for the early history of Greece and the Greeks and can be supported by further archaeological evidence from Phyla-

kope in Melos, Ialysos in Rhodes, Cyprus, and elsewhere. We can perhaps summarise it as follows:

At the beginning of the Middle Bronze Age the first Greeks entered Greece and dominated and coalesced with the previous inhabitants. During the Middle Bronze Age the Greek people advanced rapidly in culture, especially after they came in contact with the Minoan culture of Crete in the latter part of the period. Mycenae achieved supremacy on the Mainland during the first phase of the Late Bronze Age, when the Greeks imitated or absorbed much from Crete. By the opening of the second phase of the Late Bronze Age (Late Helladic II) the Greeks established themselves at Knossos and so controlled the resources which the Minoan civilisation had developed. In doing so they overthrew the other Cretan centres outside Knossos. The fall of Knossos itself about 1400 B.C., when the third phase began, was perhaps due to a revolt of the Cretans against the Greek intruders but it did not affect the position of Mycenae. Her Cyclopean fortress was built not because her rulers were afraid of raids by enemies. The recent excavations have shown that in the 14th and 13th centuries B.C., Late Helladic III A and B, large and wealthy houses were built at Mycenae well outside the protection of the Cyclopean walls. The existence of rich houses in this position shows that Mycenae then enjoyed not only great prosperity but also profound peace. If there had been real danger of raids by "Dorians" or "Peoples of the Sea" no one would have ventured to build such houses in unfortified areas. We must modify the old idea which drew a distinction between the undefended palaces of Crete, protected by the inviolate sea, and the Cyclopean citadels of the Mainland whose lords covered behind mighty walls in terror of land and sea rovers. The fortresses of the Mainland were symbols of strength, not weakness. They were presumably also intended for a practical use to shelter the civil population from enemies if any should ever come. During the late Bronze Age, the Greeks, the Mycenaeans, spread widely about the Aegean and Mediterranean. They spread through the islands to the coasts of Asia Minor, to Cyprus, Syria, Palestine, and Egypt. They reached the littoral of Macedonia and Thrace and Troy and were in contact with the ruling powers of Asia Minor and the Near East. Westwards they touched the Lipari Islands and Ischia and so presumably the coasts of Sicily and southern Italy and perhaps Malta. The active enterprise of the Mycenaeans in the Mediterranean and the Levant foreshadowed that of their descendants in the great age of Greek colonisation from the 8th century onwards.

There is yet one further point. Many archaeologists and historians have long tacitly assumed that at the end of the Bronze Age and the beginning of the Iron Age there was definite interruption in the evolution of culture in Greece caused by the "Dorian Invasion." It is true that many sites such as Mycenae were burnt and de-

stroyed at the end of the Bronze Age, but there is no sign of any interruption in the evolution of culture. In Attica, in Argolis, in Northern Greece, and in some islands there is clear evidence that from the end of the later days of the Bronze Age right through a period of transition down into the mature Iron Age there is a steady development of culture, but nowhere any break. This presumably means that the effects of the "Dorian Invasion" or the "Return of the Heraclidae" have been overemphasized by historians. The "return" of the Dorians or the coming of fresh tribes of Greeks seems not to have caused any racial or cultural break but only political disturbance in which the seats of the mighty were overthrown. Both archaeologists and historians have assumed that this period from the Late Bronze Age into the mature Iron Age was a "Dark Age," when the Greeks forgot how to write and read and degenerated in culture. The age is "dark" only because we have little or no evidence for it, archaeological, historical, linguistic. Our principal evidence comes from tombs. No inhabited site of the period has been excavated. Sites which have been excavated, like the Acropolis of Athens, were disturbed by later classical building or else were excavated in times when excavation technique had not been developed. It is hard to believe that a people as intelligent as the Greeks would have forgotten how to write and read once they learnt to do so.

Linear B tablets have been found not only in palaces as at Pylos but in private houses at Mycenae, and this fact and the use of the script in inscriptions on vases indicates that the Mycenaeans were more literate than has hitherto been supposed. Indeed the analysis of the inscriptions on the tablets shows that, to judge by the variations in handwriting, they were written by a surprising number of individuals.

The gap thus seen at present between the Linear B script and the adoption of the Phoenician alphabet may well therefore be due to the accidents of discovery or rather non-discovery. If an inhabited site of the Early Iron Age could be found and excavated it is quite probable that inscribed clay tablets might come to light. It would not be surprising if the Linear B script and the Phoenician alphabet were found to overlap.<sup>1</sup> In later Cyprus the local syllabary and the Greek alphabet overlapped and represent the same language. In later Crete the Greek alphabet was used both for Greek and for "Eteocretan" at Praisos. In our own times the Rou-

<sup>1</sup> Diels, *Elementum* (Leipzig 1899) 58, n. 3, speaking of the words used for 'letters' of the alphabet, says: "... *graphica* bei den Eliern, *phoinikēia* (nämlich *grammata*) bei den Ioniern, Herod. V. 58, Dirae Teiae, vgl. Soph. fr. 471. Der ionische Name scheint anzudeuten dass man dort auch anders als die übliche Schrift kannte. Die phönikische Erfindung setzte das alte System aus dem Kurs. ..." I owe this reference to Professor Harold Cherniss.

manians and the Turks have changed their alphabets. Even today two scripts are in use for German.

These are the first results that arise naturally from the decipherment of the Linear B tablets as Greek. As study proceeds greater enlightenment may be expected, and if documents in the Linear B script giving letters or records can be found, actual historical information may well be forthcoming to support the linguistic evidence. It is remarkable how the linguistic evidence has borne out the archaeological evidence and the manner in which it has been interpreted by Aegean archaeologists. The two urgent needs of the moment are the discovery of more documents written in the Linear B script and the excavation of an inhabited site of the Early Iron Age. Recent discoveries based on the patient analysis and study of archaeological material and on the decipherment of the Linear B script have been so spectacular that fresh discoveries in these connections need hardly cause us any surprise.

ALAN J. B. WACE

INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY  
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

## REVIEWS

### Subjunctive and Optative: Their Origin as Futures.

By E. ADELAIDE HAHN. ("American Philological Association, Philological Monographs," No. XVI.) New York: American Philological Association, 1953. Pp. xviii, 157. \$5.00. (To be ordered from Prof. P. L. MacKendrick, Sec.-Treas., American Philological Assn., 206 Bascom Hall, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisc.; or from B. H. Blackwell, Ltd., 50 Broad Street, Oxford, England.)

It is generally agreed that earlier stages of Indo-European languages stressed the category of kind of action more than that of time. Moreover it is clear that the "tenses" of the subjunctive and optative moods (other than the present tense in each) are derivative, that they grew up independently in the several languages. Hence the subjunctive and optative appear on the same footing as desiderative, momentary, continuous, perfective, imperfective, terminative, progressive, and other aspects. So far, so good. Now comes Miss Hahn to maintain that subjunctive and optative alike were both "future." The usual notion is that subjunctive is "will" and optative "wish"—both futuristic, at least, for if necessity is the mother of invention, so also is the wish father to the thought, and these take in jussive and potential and some other things that we associate with subjunctive-optative as well as futurity. But what is future? Is it time? Or aspect? Miss Hahn never quite faces this poser. I suspect that she would, if

pressed, answer aspect—which would be correct. But if she said tense, i.e. time, that would mean abandoning her main position.

The argument is, could not but be, rather fine drawn. But it is presented with all Miss Hahn's powerful battery of knowledge. One might wish that she had developed the modern technique of oppositions (contrasts), which still await demonstration in syntax, and a limited topic such as Miss Hahn's would have been a good proving ground. There is a hint on p. 41, note 64; but there is not the contrast between *mē* and *ne e-* (not "between *ne* and *mē*")? I am not at all persuaded to abandon the injunctive; the whole argument strikes me as one of those, rather fashionable today, of disagreeing with great names of the past, chiefly for the sake of disagreement. Injunctive describes with exactness the function of these augmentless secondary forms, and also the curious coincidence of forms in Latin imperfects in *ā* (*erās, -bās*), in the subjunctive in Italic and Celtic, and of the group *fuās, attigās*, and the rest. Moreover, the fact that Greek does not use the imperative in aorist prohibitions is a clear warning of the unusual feature of pro- presentation or aspect of the action to be performed, or rather not to be performed.

The most important chapter by far, though the shortest, is that on the Hittite modal particles. It is clear that the operational meanings which we associate with the grammatical term "mood" (logically an intensional referend, either of language or of meta-language) were symbolized by these particles, and infected the verbal form from them, so that in due course the particles might be abandoned. Hittite has no modal forms of the verb, but uses particles, *le* (like Latin *nē*) and *man* (like Greek *an*) in prohibitions and "unreal" expressions respectively. One may be allowed some private grief that Hittite has nothing to correspond to the long vowels of the subjunctive and optative, if only to see the expected laryngeal. But modal particles, no "future," no moods are almost as exhilarating, and fit the postulated I. Eu. pattern well.

Owners of this useful monograph will add Chantraine's *Grammaire homérique, II: Syntaxe* (Paris 1953) to the Bibliography; it is a misfortune that it appeared too late for Miss Hahn to include it herself.

JOSHUA WHATMOUGH

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

**Geschichte der griechischen Sprache, I: Bis zum Ausgang der klassischen Zeit.** By OTTO HOFFMANN. 3d ed. by ALBERT DEBRUNNER. ("Sammlung Götschen," Bd. 111.) Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1953. Pp. 156. DM 2.40.

In reading the first page of this book, where the antiquity of the art of writing in Greece is dealt with, one

must make certain mental reservations, for the work was obviously completed before Ventris and Chadwick demonstrated (*JHS* 73 [1953] 84-105) with reasonable certainty that the language of the Cretan Linear B script is Greek. But it is nonetheless an excellently written and reliable introduction to the subject, as anyone familiar with the earlier work of both Otto Hoffmann and Debrunner would expect. It is essentially a history of the Greek dialects and their use in literature of the classical period. The internal history of the Greek sounds and inflections on the one hand and the development of literary style on the other occupy a decidedly subordinate place. The main body of the work is devoted to a treatment of the relation of local dialects to the various forms of poetic and prose literature, the nature and causes of dialect mixture, and the problem of assigning individual linguistic features to their proper dialect strata. A number of features are shown to be Attic which had previously been labelled dialectic as a result of too rigid an insistence on the uniform language of official inscriptions as the test of purity; so, for example, in §§ 175 (with reservations) and 179 for tragedy, 192 for comedy, 224-225 for Thucydides and other Attic prose-writers. Due emphasis is placed throughout on the importance of textual tradition in the study of literary dialects, and especially on the ambiguities inherent in the early alphabets which the authors themselves used.

As an inexpensive and convenient introduction to the history of classical Greek this third edition is strongly to be recommended, and, if allowance is made for the lack of any really comprehensive index of words, it may also be used to advantage as a help in the reading of the large mass of early poetry and prose whose dialect is not Attic.

JAMES W. POULTNEY

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

**Corinth: Results of Excavations Conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens.** Volume XII: The Minor Objects. By GLADYS R. DAVIDSON. Princeton, N. J.: The American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1952. Pp. xiii, 366; 83 figures in text; 148 plates. \$25.00.

*Minor Objects* is the largest volume so far published in the Corinth series. It is well printed and the illustrations are good. The paper is too thick, making the book bulky—*Olynthus* X, with 227 more pages and 23 more plates, is not so big. For study of ancient private life, this publication of the debris of a city's daily life accumulated over more than two millennia is indispensable. It ranks with *Delos* XVIII and *Olynthus* X, which still holds first place for the fifth and early cen-

turies B.C., since the Greek level at Corinth has not been excavated. It is to be regretted that *Olynthus* XIV could not be used. Miss Davidson's (Mrs. Weinberg's) volume started as a Johns Hopkins dissertation in 1935, but luckily publication was postponed to include material found since and so has 2939 objects out of 8000. Many things are republished, and in no better form, but it is worthwhile to have a complete corpus. The chapters include terracotta figurines, vessels and furniture (lamps, glass, boxes, keys and locks, structural pieces), implements and instruments (loom-weights, 'tensils for spinning, weaving, sewing, toilet, and writing, religious implements, surgical and musical instruments, arms and armor, weights, gaming pieces), jewelry and dress accessories (gems, rings, earrings, necklaces and pendants, bracelets, fibulae, pins, beads, buttons, seals and stamps), and miscellaneous objects. Lamps and coins are omitted. They are "minor objects" but will be published in separate volumes. Archaic masks, seated silenoi, plastic vases and other types of terracottas, astragali, snaffle-bits, weights, netting needles, rings, and loom-weights abound at *Olynthus* but are rare at Corinth.

A few suggestions and additions occur to me: Pp. 13, 33: on jointed dolls, cf. *Olynthus* IV 40-41, XIV 142-143, 232-234. — P. 14: many of the reliefs with horse and rider are Hellenic and not Hellenistic (*AJA* 10 [1906] 159-175); for the "Temple Boy" (nos. 191-192), rare at Corinth, cf. *Olynthus* VII 280-287, XIV 58, 213-221. — P. 19: the deposit I excavated in 1903 should be dated long before 300 B.C.<sup>1</sup> — P. 21: for the Maltese dog, cf. *Olynthus* VI 110-111; *CW* 12 (1918/19) 211; *CVA*, *Robinson Coll.* 3, 21. — P. 34, no. 142: for Athena with shield, cf. *Olynthus* XIV 185-186. — P. 28, nos. 67-73: the eleven mirrors I excavated in Deposit II are omitted (*AJA* 10 [1906] 166, pl. 11, 16). — No. 85 has already been published by me in *AJA*, *loc. cit.*, pl. 10, 3: Miss Davidson does not say that it was found in the Stoa east of the Temple Hill. — For nos. 92-97, cf. the many similar figurines dug up at Corinth (*AJA*, *loc. cit.*, 165-166; also *Corinth* XV, 1, p. 104, pl. 37, nos. 51, 52; *Olynthus* XIV 153-160)—over 77 examples, nine of which I dug up myself. — The head of no. 297 evidently has been lost since I published it. — For nos. 119-129, 292-302, seated figurines, cf. *Olynthus* VII 216-219, XIV 100-101. — For nos. 126-140, 158-159, reclining figures, cf. *Olynthus* VII 84ff., nos. 278, 327, and XIV 222: there is no mention of a fragment of a couch with sphinx-leg (Athenaeus 197a) published by me, *loc. cit.* — For nos. 183, 365-374, stelae with snake, which I would date long before the third century, cf. *AJA*, *loc. cit.*, where I distinguish at least three types and mention eleven such

<sup>1</sup> Cf. now *Corinth* XV, 2, pp. 21-22; *Hesperia* 22 (1953) pl. 46b for mirror, standing female figure, stèle with snake, doves, riders, etc. from sixth or fifth century B.C.

stelae of a larger type, thirty of a smaller type, seven showing helmet on top, three of a third type, all from the sanctuary of a hero; several of these, as well as others, are in the National Museum at Athens, not at Corinth; the preliminary publication is better than the final. — For no. 195, Pan squatting and playing double flute, cf. *Olynthus* IV 84ff., VII 80, XIV no. 364 (a mould, showing that the type is peculiar to Olynthus), a Silenus rather than Pan, who should have goat's legs (cf. *Olynthus* IV 80, XIV 270). — Nos. 237, 277, 308, 310 have been already published, with drawings, *AJA*, loc. cit., pl. 11, nos. 14, 15; pl. 12, no. 18 (reference to this is given, not to others). — I find no republication of the terracottas I published in *AJA*, loc. cit., pl. 10, 1, 2, 6, 7; pl. 11, 8, 13; pl. 12, 17 (a plaque with rider to left). — The beautiful and important heads published *AJA*, loc. cit., figs. 9, 10, actor's mask 11, and 12, are not republished and there is no reference to them. — For no. 388, cf. *Olynthus* IV 334-335, 355-356, 410, 411, XIV 292. — Of the bronze bull (no. 497) there is an unpublished replica in my collection. — For nos. 1229-1231, Byzantine Bronze loom-combs, cf. a Greek example, *Olynthus* X no. 2619; for nos. 1279-1280 (spools), cf. *Olynthus* I 79-80, II 128 (more than 200), XIV 240. — For nos. 1432-1436, marble finger pestles (for crushing herbs or drugs or vegetables or colors for lip-stick—one unpublished example in the collection of the Hispanic Society of New York), no reference is given to important Olynthus examples, *Olynthus* II 106 (in form of bent leg as well as finger); cf. also Blinkenberg, *Lindos*, 3229; Vergil, *Moretum*; Cleasby, *AJA* 40 (1936) 116. — For a good parallel to the gold necklace in Athens (2055), already published *AJA* 35 (1931) 420-422, cf. a similar fourth century B.C. necklace published by me in *AJA* 57 (1953) pl. 20, fig. 40 (another in the Gans Collection). — For such eye beads as 2429-2435, cf. *Olynthus* X nos. 2652-2683. — For bronze letters preserved (2882), cf. those I found at Pissidion Antioch (*AJA* 28 [1924] 443) and those from Samothrace (*Hesperia* 22 [1953] 9).

Even though the number of parallels could be increased and though provenance and present location are not always given, this voluminous volume is one of the best archaeological publications of recent years, a scholarly and original work of the first rank.

DAVID M. ROBINSON

UNIVERSITY, MISSISSIPPI

**Plato's Earlier Dialectic.** By RICHARD ROBINSON. Second edition. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1953. Pp. x, 286. \$5.00.

The first edition of this work was published by the Cornell University Press in 1941 and is now exhausted. In preparing this second edition the author has taken

advantage of certain criticisms of reviewers to introduce some alterations in the chapters on the *Meno*, the *Phaedo*, and the *Republic*, and has also added a chapter on "Hypothesis in the *Parmenides*." These changes have made even better what was already an excellent work which had won wide recognition among Platonic scholars.

The "earlier dialectic" with which the book is concerned includes the elenchus and definition of the early dialogues, and the theory of hypothetical method in the dialogues of Plato's middle period. The theory of synthesis and division prominent in the later dialogues is excluded. One can only hope that the author plans in a future work to provide us an equally lucid and intelligible account of these difficult parts of Plato's later dialectic.

What distinguishes this book, besides the workmanlike clarity of its style, is the author's resolutely historical—or as he would call it, "evolutionist"—attitude toward the progress of human thinking. It is all too tempting, in dealing with the "divine Plato," to assume that logical rules to which we have been accustomed for generations were equally a part of his working principles, even where they are not explicitly formulated. Expositors of Plato have therefore committed all too frequently the error of "misinterpretation by insinuating the future," or "misinterpretation by going beyond the author's last words." The introductory chapter in which the author sets forth these and other common types of misinterpretation should be read and taken to heart by all Platonic commentators. Not that the author is a detractor. He holds, in fact, that Plato was a very great logician. "Greatness in science consists mainly in leaving the subject much more advanced than when you entered it. It does not consist mainly in holding the same views as a majority of men will hold at a later date, or even in holding true views" (vi).

The chapter on the *Parmenides*, which is new in this edition, is a brilliant interpretation. Against Burnet and Taylor the author maintains that the arguments of the first part are directed against the existence of Forms, not of sensibles, and that the theory of Forms discussed is that of Plato's middle dialogues. He maintains that Plato regarded these arguments as neither fatal nor negligible, but (against Taylor, Hardie, and Cherniss) as serious difficulties requiring serious attention. He rejects the "attractive view" that these arguments are answered in the *Sophist*. He maintains against a host of predecessors that the second part of the dialogue does not state a doctrine, either directly or indirectly; nor does it contain any statement of method, either directly or indirectly. Both parts of the dialogue are intended to provide Plato's pupils with practice in dialectic and in the detection of errors in reasoning. Finally, he shows the impossibility of maintaining, as Cornford attempted to do, that the second part is both a refutation of *Parmenides* and a set of exercises in mental gymnastics. It is easier to show that errors in previous interpretations than to establish



one's own; but of all the interpretations of this puzzling dialogue that this reviewer has read, Robinson's seems by all odds the most cogent.

GLENN R. MORROW

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

**The Dialogues of Plato.** Translated, with Analyses and Introductions, by B. JOWETT. Fourth edition, revised by order of the Jowett Copyright Trustees, under the general editorship of D. J. ALLAN and H. E. DALE. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1953. 4 vols. Pp. 2,992. £ 6. 6s. (\$26.00).

For more than eighty years the Jowett translation has had an enormous and salutary influence on modern thought; it is an English classic. The four volumes of the first and the second editions (1871 and 1875) were considerably improved and enlarged in the third, five-volume, edition (1892); of the latter, when the plates had been sacrificed to the first world war, reprints were made by photographic process in 1924 and 1930. But there are now better translations of some of the dialogues; and Platonic scholarship has moved on during the past half-century. Some of Jowett's introductions and essays, once stimulating and valuable, are no longer so significant as they were when they first appeared. It was time for a new and revised edition; indeed Jowett himself had contemplated such a time and such a procedure. The work has been done chiefly by the competent hands of D. J. Allan (Balliol College and Edinburgh University) and H. E. Dale (Balliol College and New College).

The editors explain (Vol. I, pp. ix-xvi) their guiding principles. For sufficient reason, the *Greater Hippias* has been added, and the *Eryxias* and *Second Alcibiades* have been dropped; the *Epistles* and the *Epinomis* are still present. The order of the dialogues has been adjusted, chiefly in accordance with generally accepted views of the order of composition. Jowett's prefatory analyses have been retained, but not his marginal analyses; marginal letters indicating portions of Stephanus pages have been added (and are now referred to in the extensive Index). Twenty-one passages (listed, Vol. I, p. xvi), from prefaces and introductions, which are now out of date or not fully relevant to the interpretation of Plato, are omitted; many of them may be found in "Select Passages from the Introductions to Plato" (J. Murray, 1902, 1904, 1950). In some cases, notes in square brackets explain the reasons for the omissions; other notes provide occasional references to recent Platonic literature.

The revised translation usually follows the text of Burnet, instead of the Stallbaum that Jowett followed; but the text of Plato is less often subject to question than is that of most other important authors. The editors

have sought here and there to correct inaccuracies of translation, or to bring the English a little closer to the Greek, for Jowett at times took liberties; but they have sought also to preserve his admirable vigor of idiom and style. I have sampled their version at many points, and almost always with admiration. Having myself edited in 1927 a volume of selections from Jowett's translation, and having corrected the translation here and there, I was curious to see how the new editors would deal with particular passages. Usually I applaud the results. I still insist, however, that *Rep.* 490d means "defined the nature of true philosophy as it must of necessity be" (cf. my note in *CP* 22 [1927] 220f.); and that *Tim.* 28c does not say that "the father and author of all this universe is past finding out," but that he "is hard to find out." But these are perhaps small points. It is a satisfaction now to have Jowett's work, slightly streamlined, available for the next generation or two of English readers.

WILLIAM C. GREENE

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

**Syntaxe latine.** By ALFRED ERNOUT and FRANÇOIS THOMAS. ("Nouvelle collection à l'usage des classes," Vol. XXXVIII.) Paris: Klincksieck, 1951. Pp. xvi, 416. No price stated.

The two distinguished scholars have here in collaboration sought to present to students the syntax of Latin in the light of recent studies, which have often modified older formulations. While stressing the syntax of the classical period, they give the developments from Plautus onward, carry the topics down through the Empire, not infrequently into much later times, and even present apposite survivals in Modern French. Where Greek influence is found, or suspected, they give the Greek phrases (in the Greek alphabet!), and evaluate the comparison. Practically nothing has escaped their consideration. Their volume should definitely replace older comprehensive handbooks.

The main text (pp. 1-383), after a brief general statement, consists of three parts: the cases, including uses with prepositions; the main clauses and their elements; the dependent clauses and their elements. An index of topics (pp. 385-393), an index of words (pp. 394-414), and the table of contents (pp. 415-416) facilitate the finding of any desired item.

Every formulation is well documented with examples, and these are, with few exceptions, translated into idiomatic French. This sets an obstacle in the student's way; for idiomatic French differs so greatly from the Latin idiom, that the translation often obscures rather than elucidates, and I often found myself going back to the Latin original to get the real meaning which had been so transformed. So even sometimes when the idio-

matic French is accompanied by a literal version—here, one simple example: in §108.5, *de mea pecunia* is translated “à mes frais,” explained as being literally “en prenant sur mon argent.” Note the inconcinnity between Latin *de* and the French prepositions; French lacks a simple unmistakable “from,” as in English “from my own money,” which is perfectly intelligible for our normal “at my own expense.” Then, again, the French pleonastic “ne” in certain subordinate clauses (as with verbs of fearing; §311) seems to make it almost impossible to explain clearly in French the corresponding usages in Latin; but in English there is no difficulty, once the basis of the idiom is understood.

No point is so small, no usage so rare, that it is deliberately omitted. Yet I cannot find a formulation for the predicate ablative in Terence, *Haut.* 217 *facili me utetur patre* “he will find me an indulgent father”; nor that for the goal in time, as in Caes. *B.G.* 1.3.2 *in tertium annum*. Perhaps I missed these somewhere.

There certainly should be a remark in §126-§127, that the lack of a present participle to *esse* is a factor in some ablative absolute; but there is none. And why is the infinitive in *turpe est mentiri* and the like, §272a, not unqualifiedly admitted to be the subject? Our authors say that this can be “only from a grammatical and exterior point of view”; but Latin (unlike French) needs no expletive pronominal subject.

I could cite other such items, but their sum would be trifling as against the thorough and exhaustive nature of the entire work. My main criticism, which I cannot set forth here, is that there is too much detail for proper assimilation by an American student, unless he is in a very advanced stage of his studies. But for advanced students this volume is a real treasure-house.

ROLAND G. KENT†

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

If you are using

### **Using Latin, Book One**

Scott, Foresman and Company's great new first year text  
by Scott, Horn, and Gummere

### **Or if you would like some good extra reading**

we are happy and proud to offer you on 35 mm. filmstrips the complete stories from this book, arranged by Waldo E. Sweet, Ph.D., Director of the Latin Workshop, Program of Linguistics, University of Michigan

### **A Teacher's Guide Book of instructions**

is available to help you in teaching your students to learn how to read Latin according to the principles of scientific linguistics.

*Write us for further details and prices.*

## **TUTOR THAT NEVER TIRES, INC.**

BRONXVILLE 8, NEW YORK

“RESPONDE MIHI” Recordings

“TEXT THAT TALKS” Filmstrips

---

## *Dynamic introductions to the Classics*

### A NEW INTRODUCTION TO GREEK

(Revised Edition)

By ALSTON H. CHASE & HENRY PHILIPS, JR. "The number . . . who desire to learn as much Greek as possible in the shortest period of time is increasing . . . The format of the book is delightful. The illustrations . . . are beautiful. The eight appendices are excellent for reference and review purposes. On the whole, this is the best of the text books published up to the moment, if the teacher is permitted to use his discretion as to time." — THELMA B. DeGRAFF, in *Classical Weekly*. \$4.00

### SHADY HILL LATIN LESSONS

By JAMES P. McCARTHY. "It should, in the hands of a competent teacher who is 'sold' on the method, provide one of the most rewarding linguistic adventures possible in our educational system. . . . A thorough and finished product, prepared by a highly competent teacher." — *The Classical Journal*. "It seems to me to give the student an excellent chance to develop his powers of observation, discrimination, and inference. . . . To any Latin teacher who is not thoroughly satisfied with the conventional Latin textbooks an examination of these 'Lessons' will prove highly rewarding." — FREDERICK F. KEMPNER in *The Classical Weekly*. \$3.75

32-page "Teacher's Guide" available to teachers.

Each, offset from typed copy, 8" x 10", punched to fit loose-leaf binders.

At your bookstore, or



**HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS**

44 Francis Avenue

Cambridge 38, Massachusetts

---